



MISSOURI
DEPARTMENT OF
NATURAL RESOURCES

Date: November 13, 2013
Time: 10:00 am to 3:00 pm
Meeting: Public Availability Session
Subject: Proposed 303(d) listing and 2016 Listing Methodology Meeting Notes

Attendees:

Trish Rielly, MoDNR	trish.rielly@dnr.mo.gov	573-526-5297
Jennifer Hoggatt, MoDNR	jennifer.hoggatt@dnr.mo.gov	573-761-1403
John Ford, MoDNR	john.ford@dnr.mo.gov	573-751-7024
Lynn Milberg, MoDNR	lynn.milberg@dnr.mo.gov	573-526-4681
John Hoke, MoDNR	john.hoke@dnr.mo.gov	573-526-1446
Leslie Holloway, Missouri Farm Bureau	lholloway@mofb.com	573-893-1409
Robert Brundage, Newman, Comley, & Ruth	rbrundage@ncrpc.com	573-634-2266
Michele Gremminger, City of O'Fallon	micheleg@ofallon.mo.gov	636-379-7632

The public availability session was set up as an informal meeting to allow stakeholders the opportunity to provide comments or questions relating to the proposed 2014 303(d) list and the 2016 Listing Methodology Document (LMD).

A few clarifying questions were asked regarding streams proposed for delisting, what information was used to delist, and if selected streams were scheduled for additional monitoring. For the streams in question that were proposed for delisting, all were originally listed based upon fish Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) scores. Of these streams, the majority proposed for delisting were due to the lack of habitat data: 1) If there was a lack of habitat data to accompany the fish IBI scores, the water body was not assessed 2) if the water body had low habitat score (below 0.39) the water body was not assessed.

Discussions occurred regarding newly listed streams and what had caused them to be listed during this listing cycle and not previous cycles. For the streams of interest, the water quality assessment sheets were reviewed which indicated new water quality data was available and was used during this current listing cycle.

Many stakeholder questions and comments related to the bioassessment work group discussions, decisions, or unresolved issues. The main questions were related to how fish IBI scores were assessed in relation to poor habitat and how many streams were added to the list of impaired waters based upon the assessment procedures that were followed. Much discussion occurred between stakeholders and department staff who had been involved in the bioassessment work group. The department plans to use the scores recommended by the biologist for the 2016 LMD. By following this process, one additional stream would have been added to the impaired waters list had this process been used for the 2014 303(d) list.

Other discussions relating to bioassessment workgroup topics (Issue 5) were unresolved: would a stream be listed as impaired based upon one taxonomic group? Overall, numeric water quality standards would be used to support an impairment decision. However, biological community

information and other numeric translators of general criteria would be used when numeric criteria are available or when general criteria indicate impairment.

Clarifying statements were suggested to be added to the proposed 2016 listing methodology document, along with a summary of changes that had occurred. Participating stakeholders were asked to provide examples of preferred wording.

Clarification was provided that fish IBI scores are only used for Ozarks streams. Until other fish IBI metrics are developed for the other ecoregions, only Ozarks streams will be assessed using this method. Information was provided to members of the bioassessment workgroup who were present. The information summarized how fish IBI and habitat data were evaluated and used during the 2014 assessment process. Discussion continued for specific streams of concern to determine if the impairment was due to habitat or other issues. A follow-up e-mail was sent out to the workgroup later in the day to provide information on the listing process for Ozark streams, and how habitat and low flow concerns were addressed. Additional information describing the fish bioassessment process was recommended to be added to the proposed 2016 listing methodology document.

Stakeholders suggested updating portions of the 303(d) list of impaired waters table to provide a clearer understanding of what the table is stating. The department may be limited on what information can be updated and/or changed since the table is formatted to match EPA's database requirements.

A stakeholder stated the Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) data needs to be available to help make sense of the data. A general overview of the department's process was provided to help explain the various levels of QA/QC utilized by the department. Information provided on the Chemical Analysis results sheets was discussed, and how information is reviewed to determine validity of data. In addition, the department also has established Quality Assurance Program Plans and Standard Operating Procedures that are followed to ensure quality data is generated.

In closing, the stakeholders were asked to follow-up in writing with specific questions they would like addressed. By doing so, their questions and comments become part of the department's administrative record for these efforts.